

**REMARKS**

5 Claims 1-24 were examined in the Non-Final office action mailed on 08/08/2007 (hereafter "Outstanding Office Action"). All claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by United States Patent Application 5,701,480 naming as inventor Raz (hereafter "Raz").

10 By virtue of this amendment, the specification and claims 1, 7, 10, 13, 14, and 16 are sought to be amended, claim 25 is sought to be added, and claims 11, 12, 22, 23, and 24 are sought to be canceled. The amendments, addition and cancellations are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. The amendments and cancellations are made without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-10, 13-21 and 25 are respectfully presented for reconsideration.

***Specification***

15 The abstract of the disclosure was objected to alleging that it contains the title of the invention. In response, the title is sought to be removed from the Abstract. Withdrawal of the objection as against the specification is respectfully requested.

20 The specification is further sought to be amended to recite . "Thus, the procedure calls in the user program of Figure 2 contains two separate procedures, P1() and R1() ." This amendment is supported, at least by each of the TSTEP procedure calls in lines 215, 225, 255, 260, 265 and 270. No new matter is accordingly believed to be introduced by the amendment, and entry of the amendment is therefore respectfully requested.

***Claim Objections***

25 Claim 10 has been objected to, noting that the term "roll back" should be spelled "rollback". The objection is rendered moot as the term has been deleted by the foregoing amendments.

Withdrawal of the objection as against claim 10 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is thanked for the detailed examination. In addition, it is noted that the undersigned representative has checked the pending claims for the term 'roll back', and finds no more of that term in the claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112***

5            Claims 10 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, allegedly as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Without acquiescing to the allegations, it is submitted that the rejections are rendered moot in view of the cancellation of claims 22-24 and the foregoing amendments to claim 10.

10            Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as against claims 10 and 22-24 is respectfully requested.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

             Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Raz. Without acquiescing to the Examiner's contentions, it is submitted that the rejections are rendered moot at least in view of the foregoing amendments.

15            For example, currently amended independent claim recites, among other features, that:  
             1. "... requesting in a user program a transaction identifier for an atomic transaction";  
             and  
             2. "... specifying in said user program a plurality of combinations, wherein each of said plurality of combinations contains said transaction identifier, a task procedure, and a rollback  
20            procedure, wherein said task procedure implements a part of said atomic transaction and said rollback procedure is designed to rollback said task procedure; ... wherein said rollback procedure is specified as a separate procedure from said task procedure in said user program,  
             ..."

25            For the benefit of the Examiner, it is pointed out that the claimed user programs are illustrated with reference to Figure 2 of the subject application. The user program there is

shown requesting a transaction identifier in line 209. The claimed combinations including the transaction identifier, the task procedure (forming a part of the atomic transaction) and the corresponding rollback procedure are shown in each of the lines 215, 225, 255, 260, 265 and 270. As noted above, each of these lines shows a task procedure and a rollback procedure as  
5 separate procedures.

The claimed user programs are akin to application program 90 of Raz, as will be apparent to a skilled practitioner by reading the disclosure of the subject application.

The application programs of Raz do not have the specific claimed intelligence for implementing atomicity of transactions.

10 Rather, in Raz, common underlying components facilitate rollback, at least as evidenced by Figure 5 of Raz. It is clearly shown there that digital computer 20 contains application programs 90, and various other components (transaction manager 92, resource manager 91, etc.) together implement the atomicity desired for the application program. This conclusion is further supported at least by the below specification of Raz:

15 Turning now to FIG. 5A, there is shown a block diagram of the programming and data structures used in the digital computer 20 of FIG. 1. for scheduling transactions and enforcing global transaction commitment ordering. Global and local transactions are initiated, for example, by application programs 90. To commit the  
20 results of transactions to state memory 28, 29 and to recover from failures, the digital computer is provided with a resource manager (RM) 91 that, for example, performs the operations shown in FIG. 3. ***The resource manager 91, for example, also manages a transaction list (TL) 93 as further described below with reference to FIG. 6. In general, a resource manager (RM) is a software component that manages state memory resources affected by committing transactions in such a way that the memory state of the resources can be restored before the transaction is committed by effectively undoing all of the changes introduced by the transaction.*** (Col. 18, Lines 14-30 of Raz, Emphasis Added)  
25  
30

Accordingly the user applications of Raz would not perform the claimed specific tasks (at least the two features noted above).

Raz further relies on making a backup copy to revert back to state prior to an aborted

transaction, at least based on the below:

To deal with the problem of possible failure when writing to non-volatile memory, there has been established a method of programming called "transaction processing" which guarantees that a portion of the non-volatile memory (referred to hereinafter as "state memory") will either be unaffected by a transaction or will be properly updated by results of a transaction, in the presence of the failures. **Transaction processing is based upon the technique of making a back-up copy of state memory before the results of a transaction are written to state memory, and also writing in non-volatile memory an indication of either a first processing phase in which the back-up copy is being made, or a second processing phase in which the results of a transaction are being written to state memory, in order to indicate which copy might have been corrupted during a failure.** For making a back-up copy of state memory, for example, the non-volatile memory 23 includes two banks of state memory 28 and 29. To provide an indication of which bank of state memory might have been corrupted by a failure, the non-volatile memory 23 includes a memory location 30 for storing a switch or flag.  
(Col. 12, lines 15-25 of Raz, **Emphasis Added**)

Due to such a feature, it may be reasonably deduced that any rollback of Raz would be based on the inherent logic in task procedures.

In sharp contrast, currently amended claim 1 relies on a user program providing the rollback procedures, which are separate from the task procedures.

Further, since Raz teaches a alternative solution to a potentially similar objective as in claim 1, Raz teaches away from currently amended claim 1.

At least for such reasons, currently amended claim 1 is allowable over Raz.

Currently amended claim 7 is also allowable for at least some of the reasons noted above in reciting that, "**requesting an identifier in said user program from a transaction manager** for said atomic transaction, wherein said transaction manager generates a unique value as said identifier; setting a variable to equal said identifier; specifying a plurality of combinations **in said user program** for execution in said system, wherein each of said plurality of combinations **contains said variable transaction identifier, a task procedure, and a rollback procedure,...**" (**Emphasis Added**)

Again, since the application programs of Raz rely on common components, the application programs of Raz would neither request an identifier nor specify (using a variable) an identifier along with task procedures.

Accordingly, currently amended claim 7 is also allowable over Raz.

5           Currently amended independent claims 10 and 16 are allowable over Raz at least in reciting, "... wherein said rollback procedure is specified as a separate procedure from said task procedure in said user program."

10           Accordingly all the independent claims presented for consideration are allowable over Raz. The dependent claims are allowable at least as depending from the corresponding base claims.

### ***Conclusion***

15           Thus, it is believed that all rejections have been overcome. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the final rejection and continue examination. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at 707.356.4172 if it is believed that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,

/Narendra Reddy Thappeta/

Signature

Date: December 17, 2007

Printed Name: Narendra Reddy Thappeta

Attorney for Applicant

Registration Number: 41,416